DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 449 SP 020 829

AUTHOR Hall, Gene E.; Hord, Shirley M.
TITLE Water Around Our Ankles, Fingers in the Hold, Where Is the Life Raft.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).
AVAILABLE FROM Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin, Ed. Annex 3.203, Austin, TX 78712 ($2.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Futures (of Society); Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Organizational Change; Professional Associations; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; Schools of Education; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; Teacher Orientation

ABSTRACT

From a general overview presented of the current state of teacher education, proposals for improvement and development are suggested: (1) Teacher education should be the basis for the pulling together of the various mini-disciplines that now exist; (2) Teacher education associations should be merged into one influential organization; (3) Support networks for sharing information and working on common problems should be established; (4) Departments of teacher education should be established to encompass the present teacher education subgroups that are loosely interconnected; (5) Education faculty should be assigned office space not by subject matter taught but in such a way that interaction and collaboration may take place easily and thus encourage interdisciplinary dialogue about all programs; (6) Collaboration between professionals in the field and college based teacher educators should be encouraged; (7) Colleges of advanced education and professional graduate schools should be established; (8) Potential teachers should be put directly into the field with a bachelor's degree and allowed to learn on the job; (9) Independent agencies or contractors on an industrial basis who will train teachers should be established; (10) Teacher education programs should be organized and designed in terms of a professional continuum rather than a dichotomy with preservice distinctly separated from inservice; (11) Programs and resources should be developed to support beginning teachers for the first 3 years of teaching; (12) More emphasis should be placed on staff development for teacher educators; (13) Teacher educators should have the opportunity to teach school age students in the field; (14) A national diffusion network for teacher educators should be established; (15) Establish a journal for research and development in teacher education; and (16) The importance of continuous and constructive evaluation in teacher education should be recognized. (JD)

ED220449

WATER AROUND OUR ANKLES, FINGERS IN THE HOLE, WHERE IS THE LIFE RAFT

Gene E. Hall

Shirley M. Hord

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New York City, 1982

SP 020 829

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gene E. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

WATER AROUND OUR ANKLES, FINGERS IN THE HOLE, WHERE IS THE LIFE RAFT[1,2]

Gene E. Hall

Shirley M. Hord

Research and Development Center For Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

We've seen the frail craft of teacher education tossed upon the seas of uncertainty and public outcry; one wave of criticism and attack after another has been launched. We think teacher education has been adrift now for an unconscionable amount of time. We are ready to get on with charting a course for good harbor and stop bailing water. Toward this end we would like to examine the rough troughs of current issues in teacher education and then consider some ways to set the sails.

Specifically, we propose to quickly review the state of teacher education by looking at present practice and the conduct of program evaluation studies. We also plan to highlight current issues confronting teacher education, both those receiving attention and some that are being ignored. We will conclude by proposing some suggestions about the directions that teacher education and program evaluation could take.

---

[1]The research described herein was conducted under contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education. No endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

[2]An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the conference on Fresh Perspectives on the Improvement of Teacher Education Programs, The Ohio State University, College of Education, November 19-20, 1981.

Teacher Education Issues and Pressures

Before suggesting next steps it is important to examine the present pressures and some of the issues about which teacher educators and others are concerned. This review is not being presented as another repitition of the doom and gloom reviews that have been so frequently heard in the last several years. Rather, this review is being presented as one way to organize our understandings of the present state of teacher education and to provide a general framework for the proposing of action. It is worth emphasizing that the assumption that we bring to this paper is that teacher educators can make a difference. We also believe that teacher educators do not have to be passive victims of contexts. Further, we believe that it is time for action and for a renewed commitment to what all of us can do to improve the quality of schooling through working with teachers.

There are many issues that we could identify and use in this brief review. The ones that we have selected to summarize seem to be representative of a wide array of concerns and pressures that teacher educators are feeling. In addition, we believe that all of these issues can be addressed. Thus, we have deliberately stayed away from those where we feel personally incapacitated and instead we are focusing on the ones that we think collectively we could do something.

1. We have lost the limelight. Teacher education missed its latest opportunity. We would contend that the national attention that has been focused on teacher education over the last 18 months was an opportunity. Unfortunately, most teacher educators interpreted this attention as an unwarranted attack, and as a result few constructive proposals were put forth. If teacher educators had viewed this national interest in teacher education as

an opportunity for renewal and if major novel directions for teacher education had been proposed, we believe that support and action would have been possible.

However, it appears that most teacher educators took cover. They went underground in hopes that national concern would move on to something else and it has. Now it is less likely and perhaps impossible to regain the attention of the various political and economic resources that were ready to support a rebirth of teacher education. In the meantime, the limelight has shifted. Most teacher educators probably view this as good news. However, it also represents a lost opportunity.

Parenthetically, it appears to us that school administrators are the group now receiving a good deal of national press. It will be interesting to see if they are able to make use of this as a potential resource or whether they too will head for the bomb shelters.

2. No national vision. It is our contention that at this time there is no national vision in teacher education. There is no consensus among teacher educators about where teacher education should be going. There are no exciting or even boring new models of teacher education being proposed. There seems to be very little to spark the imagination of teacher educators or teachers or other consumers at the national level.

3. No competing visions. Few intensive analyses of teacher education and its possibilities have been proposed in recent years. There is an absence of advocates for particular models and views with regard to teacher education such as there were during the early 1970's. At that time the CBTE/anti-CBTE leaders and followers created a dynamic interchange and spirit of program development that has since been lost. In the late 1970's, the proposal by

Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark & Nash, Educating the Profession (1976), that teachers and teacher education be viewed as a profession, received all too little attention. More recently Bunnie Smith has proposed a school of pedagogy (Smith, Silverman, Borg & Fry, 1980) and there are some individuals such as Joyce (Joyce & Showers, 1981) who are examining various training models and their implications for teacher education.

None of these recent efforts have created the excitement and focusing of energy that occurred in the early 1970's. Rather, there seems to be a general malaise among teacher educators. Any ideas that are suggested are not really given a great deal of serious thought or trial. Perhaps if there were competing views to some of the more recent proposals or if there were a series of national dialogues between Howsam, Smith, Joyce and others, this might stimulate more thought and reexamination of programs.

4. Lack of proactive leadership. It does not appear that our national spokespersons, policy makers and association leaders have any great sense of efficacy or vision about where teacher education should move. Our leaders are not stimulating reflection or focused discussion around the examination of teacher education programs. They too seem to be contributing to the general feelings of helplessness. There seems to be a defensive preoccupation with legislation, governance, accountability legislation and maintaining FTE's, rather than considering how to use the same situations as opportunities to improve teacher education.

5. Preservice or inservice, another dichotomy. An area where continuing teacher education practice does not reflect reality is in the failure to recognize that professional development occurs along a career long continuum from preservice to induction through inservice. It appears that programs, institutions and certification procedures view the teacher in dichotomous

chunks--preservice or inservice--and neither the continuum in general nor the induction phase in particular are given extensive consideration in the United States.

6. Lack of hotbeds of creativity in program development. Unlike the early 1970's it is very difficult in 1981 to cite more than a few teacher training institutions presently exploring alternate strategies in program design. There are very few institutions that are nationally recognized for their involvement in program development. Perhaps there is a great deal of activity going on and we just don't know about it. However, when we ask educators to name institutions that are doing something in the area of preservice teacher education program development, we tend to get more blank responses than even half hearted nominations. That a conference like this is occurring at Ohio State University is a very positive indicator. A few other institutions are showing signs of being restless. Perhaps we are at the very beginning of a new era of program development and experimentation.

7. Teacher education is fragmented. Very few faculty members and school based personnel refer to themselves first and foremost as teacher educators. To use the higher education example, most faculty in the colleges of education refer to themselves as educational psychologists, reading methods instructors or science educators, or math educators. The consequence is that the faculty is dissected into mini-disciplines (smaller units of the field of teacher education) and do not view themselves as contributing to the total of teacher education. Another problem that results from this fragmentation is the regular occurrence of gaps and redundancies in programs. Further, the lack of cohesion results in a failure to communicate information that might be potentially useful in addressing problems of mutual concern.

8. Teacher education research. A related problem is the absence of an association or associations that serve as vehicles for the reporting of teacher education research. There are extremely limited opportunities in the professional journals to publish research that is expressly targeted to teacher education. It is much easier to publish research that has to do with advancing the knowledge of a particular discipline. Although the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and National Staff Development Council (NSDC) all acknowledge that research should be important, even a cursory examination of their annual programs and their publications illustrates that research does not account for a large amount of attention. This is not to suggest that the associations are totally at fault. From our experience in reviewing journal articles and annual meeting paper proposals that supposedly report research in teacher education, a large proportion of the papers and studies do not meet minimum expectations for reliable research.

9. Who has responsibility for teacher education. An issue that we see becoming increasingly important is the institutional responsibility for teacher education. Traditionally, preservice teacher education was viewed as the sole responsibility of colleges and departments of education. However, more recently schools and intermediate educational units are playing increasingly prominent roles in the conduct of teacher education experiences. It seems also, that teacher unions may be demonstrating more interest in controlling teacher education. We think that this issue may continue to be a hot one in the 1980's.

10. Accountability. One of the major issues that teacher education is facing is that of program evaluation and follow-up studies. Teachers as well as teacher educators nationally are being confronted with the prospect of

evaluation. The place of various evaluation and accountability procedures, how they will be designed, who will be in charge of them and what will be done with the resultant information are problematic. This issue will be examined much more closely during the 1980's and in the last section of this paper.

Teacher Education in the Near Future: DO SOMETHING

Our first and basic recommendation out of analysis of the present state of teacher education and the activities of teacher educators, policy makers and others, is that the constant milling around and "dooming and glooming" has to stop. Teacher educators need to do something, anything, just do something. It would be nice if some concentrated move could be made in one or two specific directions. That way there would be a chance to have different pieces of work accumulating. However any sort of initiative and direction would be better than what has been happening for the last several years.

In the next section of this paper, we will propose some of our ideas about proactive directions and steps that we would like to see taken. We think that all of these ideas are doable. We are interested in stimulating discussion about how to go about which ones we should do; we are not interested in hearing why they can't be done. Then, in the last section of this paper, additional suggestions will be made that specifically address program evaluation and follow-up.

Pulling Together

One important area that individual teacher educators, institutions of teacher education and national leaders should be working on is the pulling together of our various interests. This can be done and specifically we propose the following:

1. Use teacher education as a unifying theme. Teacher education could be the basis for the pulling together of the various mini-disciplines. The various actors in combination represent a large enough mass of support that we could influence policy interests and attract resources. If teacher education were the main area of interest, the various individual interests should be acknowledged and attended to. But using teacher education as the shared theme would allow for a larger collective totality than we presently have with each subfaction trying to go its own way.

2. Merge the teacher education associations. There is need for the various teacher education associations to pull together under one more comprehensive umbrella which could be called the National Association for Teacher Education. Not only AACTE and ATE, but also the National Staff Development Council should be involved. All have interests in and the shared responsibility for teacher education. Why do we continue to maintain separate associations when one large association could pull together, coordinate and facilitate the continuing interest and support that is needed? This macro association could have divisions that hold concurrent meetings and address sub-needs.

An additional pressure for this merger is the increasing interest in the establishment of an association for research in teacher education. There are many who feel that there are few avenues for reporting out and addressing teacher education related research and development activities. There have been some discussions of attempting to establish another association and journal that would address teacher education r&d. This in many ways would be an unfortunate step. It would be much better for all if one consolidated teacher education association covered the various dimensions of teacher education, including governmental relations, administration, inservice,

research, development and practice in teacher education at the higher ed and school based levels.

3. Establish new networks. Within teacher education there is a need to establish and support networks for sharing information and working on common problems. This Ohio State Conference contributes to such networking. An important development in this area is the TEPFU network that the Texas R&D Center has been facilitating. This network is described in another part of this paper. In general there are several areas where there is activity underway for which the participants are unable to share ideas. In one of these areas are the teacher education researchers who are wanting a way to share. Why not involve in such endeavors the various mini-disciplines as well, such as the Association for the Education of Teachers of Science.

4. Establish departments of teacher education. For those institutions that have departments of curriculum and teaching etc., that really focus on teacher education program development, operation and research, we would encourage that the departments be renamed and be called departments of teacher education. We could encourage schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDE's) to reorganize so that departments encompassing the various subgroups that have to do with teacher education are tied together around the shared theme of teacher education. This would bring together the substantive expertise, related research and field experiences that would help build the larger, shared body. The sub-interests could still be there; however, rather than the sub-interests controlling directions individually, the overall shared theme of teacher education would be the primary mover.

5. Assigning space to faculty. How many institutions have faculties which are arranged and assigned space in order to serve teacher education programs rather than the various mini-disciplines. On the campus or in the

college of education, math educators are housed together in one wing of the building while language arts specialists are grouped together in another location. This is not to say that officing near to subject matter colleagues is not useful, but it does not contribute to interaction and dialogue which might encourage more global attention on the overall teacher education program, rather than on "how many hours of math" students will be required to take. Organizing faculties into interdisciplinary groups might very constructively support interdisciplinary dialogue about programs.

6. Faculty collaboration. It would seem that teacher education program faculty would need to be highly collaborative. How much collaboration is operating within faculties? Is interaction and collaboration nurtured and reinforced by the institution's administrators? A typical perception of the college of education is as one giant honeycomb, each faculty member occupying a single cell, with little cross pollination occurring. When new faculty come on board, what happens? Are they assigned a cell and left to do their own thing? Or is there a system or plan in place for integrating them, for aiding them to contribute to the totality of the teacher education enterprise.

7. Collaboration with the field. How much collaboration with professionals in the field occurs in most teacher education programs? It would appear that most school based teacher educators cooperate in providing settings for field experiences of teacher education students. How often is there exploration into, discussion about and pursuit of truly collaborative ways for the school based and college based team to work together. Operating collaboratively would make it possible to enhance field based teacher education programs by incorporating the expertise and strengths of each of the teacher educators.

Organizational Changes

In addition to pulling together around the theme of teacher education there are other activities that could be done to strengthen the role and utility of teacher education. There are many institutional arrangements that are regularly identified as barriers to improving teacher education. Well, if these are barriers, then let's do something.

1. Create colleges of advanced education. Why does teacher education have to be viewed within the present SCDE parameters and constraints? For example, in Australia new institutions were developed in recent years that are referred to as Colleges of Advanced Education. Granted, as with all creations, there are advantages and disadvantages to this approach. However, if teacher education cannot be given due recognition within the present SCDE structure, then why not create alternatives? Develop new organizational arrangements within present institutions or develop alternative institutions.

2. Establish professional graduate schools. It would seem that there could be mechanisms for creating education graduate schools. In fact this is being tried in some places as an alternative to the more typical inclusion of graduate teacher education programs in the arts and science graduate schools. These new schools could be organized solely for education or in conjunction with other professional areas. This new arrangement would provide more control over teacher education graduate programs. If we continue to be a part of the arts and sciences graduate schools, then the advantage for continuing to do so should be espoused.

3. Do away with preservice teacher education. Perhaps the time has come to discontinue preservice teacher education. There are insufficient credit hours, the students do not have the sufficient knowledge base and maturity at that time, and presently it is difficult to identify research that shows that

it really makes much difference. Perhaps it is time to make the conscious decision to not worry about preservice teacher education. Put potential teachers directly into the field with a bachelor's degree and allow them to learn on the job. This proposal is seriously being argued by the Commissioner of Education in Virginia right now. It seems there is more research to support doing this than there is to support maintaining the preservice program in its present form.

4. Put teacher education in the private sector. Perhaps it is time to establish independent agencies or contractors on an industrial basis who will train teachers. They would be free from the present restrictions of the SCDE context. They could go about training teachers in terms of what is presently known about training and what is presently thought to be important for teachers to be able to do and which would make it possible to be more responsive to the changing needs of teachers in the field. Private sector teacher training institutions (PSTTI) could be controlled by the profession and could be subject to licensing.

Program Development: Refine, Rethink, Do Differently

It seems as if we are over due for reexamination of our present programs. There has been ten years of new research in teacher effects, for example, and in other areas. New research knowledge and theories are available about what teachers should be able to do and about strategies for training them. It would seem as if the time is right for a reexamination of teacher education programs and a new wave of development efforts. Some of the strands that should be considered in doing this and some of the ways that these new programs might be designed include the following:

1. The professional continuum. We believe that teacher education should be viewed as a career-long professional continuum. It is not a dichotomy,

with preservice distinctly separated from inservice. Rather there is a gradual development that occurs from preservice to induction through inservice. It behooves the responsible and effective teacher educators and teacher education programs to be organized and designed in terms of this professional continuum.

2. Recognition of induction. Scholars in various parts of the United Kingdom have an extended history of documentation and research in regard to induction. They fully recognize the significance of the first one to three years of inservice and have special programs, designs and support systems to assist beginning teachers. Teacher educators in the United States have only begun to recognize that induction is a specific period to be considered.

Induction clearly represents an open territory. It is a part of the marketplace that no particular type of institution or program has grabbed. There clearly is a need. It would seem that imaginative teacher educators will be developing programs and resources for this area. If they don't, educators in other settings will probably do so.

Teacher Educator Development

One area where there is definite need for further refinement and work is that of teacher educator staff development. For some reason a common belief among teacher educators is that once they receive their "terminal" degrees all formal learning is accomplished. Not since the days of the Training Teachers of Teachers (TTT) grants has there been a sizable amount of money available to support the retooling and exchange of information among teacher educators. It is interesting to note that with much less money than a TTT grant the Dean's Grants projects are providing a great deal of teacher educator staff development. Dean's Grants seem to be the only significant outside resource,

yet teacher education staff development is a crticial need and there have to be ways to respond. Here are some of our ideas.

1. Require teacher educator staff development. Some deans have actually gone out on a limb and informed faculty that salary increases and promotions will be reviewed from the deans office in light of staff development activities, such as participation in clinical supervision experiences, particular training workshops, etc. If we are to design teacher education for the future in ways that are responsive, if there will be institutions and programs that reflect this responsiveness, then it clearly requires teacher educators to continue to develop and grow. It does mean that in many instances teacher educators will be asked to give up their original mini-discipline and be asked to learn new skills that are needed to respond to emerging needs. Support and opportunity for this kind of staff development should be there, as well as for the general learning of different ideas and the reporting of recent research and development findings for all faculty.

2. Have teacher educators teach. Teacher educators should have the opportunity to teach school age students. This is not to suggest that it is a prerequisite for the hiring of teacher educators; in fact, a fairly strong argument can be put together that it might be best if many teacher educators had not gone through teacher education programs. Perhaps they might be more flexible in their thinking about what teacher education and teaching could be about. At any rate it does seem important that a large proportion of the faculty of a teacher education program have had current or recent experience in teaching school age students. It would seem as if this could be built in as a regular part of faculty development activities, with due points in the reward system of course.

3. Establish a national diffusion network for teacher educators. Some discussion by the National Diffusion Network has taken place around establishing a higher education national diffusion network. The Reagan budget has slowed this idea down. Perhaps one activity of our merged teacher education association would be to facilitate the communication of information with regard to recent research and teacher education program development activities. Perhaps it would even be possible to create the equivalent of "state facilitators" and "developer demonstrators" who could work with prospective institutions in establishing new techniques and procedures and redesigning their programs. We know from personal experience here at the Texas R&D Center that when we were doing this in the early 1970's in our Inter-Institutional Program that it was a very rewarding and fruitful experience for the teacher education institutions as well as for us in the R&D Center. Perhaps it is time to revisit this idea.

Research in Teacher Education

Research is being conducted in many areas; most notably it is being targeted toward classroom issues or other issues of policy concern. Little is being conducted for the primary purpose of addressing teacher education issues. It would seem that if we were to develop a critical mass in teacher education we should be able to ask researchers to examine, generalize and extrapolate from their research findings to implications for teacher education. However, it is of critical importance to launch studies which address issues and problems specific to teacher education.

1. Conduct studies in teacher education. There is no shortage of research studies that could be done in teacher education. Recently there was a very elaborate research agenda building effort for teacher education (Hall, 1979). An overwhelming array of research questions, of national interest and

researchable, was identified. If we had a national association for teacher education (NATE),* then this association could further stimulate and support such research in teacher education. Publication and dissemination of research findings and the linking of findings with program development activities would seem to be a crucial function of such an association.

2. Establishing a journal for research and development in teacher education. There is need for a journal for research in teacher education. This journal would provide a vehicle for faculty and others who have been doing research and development activities in teacher education to publish their work. At present there are very limited avenues that researchers and program developers can turn to, to describe their work to the teacher education community. It is time to establish a journal that can do this.

Using Evaluation for the Improvement of Teacher Education Programs: One Way to DO SOMETHING

We have been discussing teacher education at large: current conditions, issues, challenges. We've highlighted what we consider to be promising possibilities for revitalizing teacher education and teacher education programs. One area to which we've been alluding in this discussion is that of program evaluation. We think a very practical and fruitful strategy for improving current practice in our programs is the employment of evaluation, and we want to focus especially on it in this concluding section of the paper.

Why do program evaluation? How to do it? Is it useful? These are questions which have not received much attention. However, there are a few program evaluation activists loose in the sea and they tend to stir up the

*This acronym is not that bad. It would even honor a senior scholar who has done much to model the links between research, teacher education and teacher practice that we are talking about.

waters a bit wherever they ply their oars. We would note specifically those gathered here today, giving their time and energy to consider evaluation. There are others. Thanks to Ohio State University and the state of Ohio, both of which have provided leadership and organized activities focusing on program evaluation, this topic is becoming more illuminated. We would propose that program evaluation is a way to address some of the issues and problems that have received abundant attention.

Why Do Program Evaluation?

There is enormous diversity of opinion about what teacher education programs are currently doing. Typically, teacher education programs are thought of as an elementary or secondary preservice professional preparation sequence. This usually translates into a series of required and optional course offerings from which students may select. Student choices then result in an array of configurations of "programs." How programmatic are these?

To say it differently, how many institutions really have programs versus collections of course offerings? To think programmatically would suggest the articulation of clear program goals to be addressed by a comprehensive set of courses that are integrated so that gaps and undue overlapping do not occur. Each course would respond to particular objectives which would not require repitition in other courses. Each course would be a building block, contributing harmoniously to the program structure as a whole. It would make good sense to collect evaluation information about programs--what they are doing, and the effect they are exercising. The possession of concrete data would make it possible to measure the congruence of what is against what should be and thus make information-based decisions about revisions to be made in programs.

Regardless of whether evaluation is done because the Dean says so, because the Legislature is coming, or the college is about to be "NCATEd," identifying program deficiences is a vital endeavor. Thus, periodically taking soun ngs about what's happening would contribute to informing opinion with hard data and avoiding the shoals of program shipwreck.

How Do You Do Program Evaluation?

Which data collection methodologies are appropriate? What sampling techniques are valid? Where do we look for guidance? What kinds of evaluation can be afforded? What about instrumentation? These are questions teacher education practitioners have been asking for some time now. At the R&D Center we don't do program evaluation. However, a part of the Center's mission is to facilitate and coordinate various activities which link communities of scholars in teacher education, both nationally and internationally. Therefore, we see our role as facilitating those who are evaluating their teacher education programs and in serving as a national liaison. While we don't presume to tell teacher educator practitioners how to do evaluation, we've been engaged in an array of activities that helps them to become aware of the variety of evaluation techniques and procedures available. There has been action in the area of program evaluation and the pace is currently escalating. A review of things that have happened, that are occurring, and that will take place in the immediate future is illuminating.

A brief history of evaluation activities. "In the beginning," J. T. Sandefur at Western Kentucky University was commissioned by AACTE and consequently developed a model for evaluating teacher education graduates (1970). This document was the cornerstone of evaluation studies done by Adams (1978) at Western Kentucky University and by Ayers (1978) at Tennessee Technological University. The deans of these two institutions, Sandefur and

Edell Hearn, had a vision: that programs could be improved. To that end they supported the development of program evaluation. Those activities at Western and Tennessee Tech continue; they have quite a long track record now.

The competency-based movement and the development of competency-based programs stimulated the generation of evaluation strategies to assess the effectiveness of these programs. Thus, at the University of Nebraska, Weber State in Utah, University of Houston, at Toledo, and in Oregon, evaluation became an important endeavor. Additionally, the activities of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) contributed to institutional interest in evaluation. These were initial efforts to answer the "how do you do" question; attempts were made to design evaluation and follow-up studies to assess teacher education programs.

A "sufficient" number of individuals and institutions were engaged in the how to do its of program evaluation to offer some reports of their efforts at the annual AACTE meeting in 1978. At this time, the Borich (1977) models, which had developed out of international concern for the evaluation of inservice teacher education programs and which were supported by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), were presented.

The R&D Center observed these national and international efforts. In conversation with colleagues who were doing evaluation, the R&D Center suggested that these pioneers might benefit from sharing and learn more from each other about the how to do its of evaluation studies. With the support of the R&D Center and the National Institute of Education a handful of institutions convened in the late spring of 1978.

Out of this collegial activity came several results: (1) The reports of how to do evaluation studies from the participating institutions were published in a monograph (Hord & Hall, 1979). We believe this was a first

effort to provide a comprehensive look at what was happening related to program evaluation in this country. (2) A nucleus of program evaluators who had experience was formed. (3) As a way to provide "connections" for these individuals and institutions, a communication network was established to link this community of scholars. Thus, the Teacher Education Program Follow-Up (TEPFU) network was initiated. Informal memoes and random meetings of this group were extended to all persons interested in becoming involved in evaluation. This network has grown enormously and has been supported by a newsletter produced by the R&D Center.

Current happenings in program evaluation. In February, 1981, a three hour session on the annual AACTE meeting program was allocated to Western Kentucky University and R&D Center collaborators. This session, attended by 250 persons, was organized in two parts: the reporting of six invited papers, followed by discussion of all participants in small groups led by facilitators. These groups interacted about the presented papers and expressed their concerns about program evaluation. The presented papers and the statements produced out of the group discussions resulted in a second mongraph (Hord & Adams, 1981), a reference of increased sophistication about evaluation and how to do it. These volumes report on evaluation practice and are available to practitioners.

Individuals and institutions are currently doing something in evaluation and this is reflected in the Adams and Craig (1981) report. They conducted a study which surveyed 445 institutions about their present evaluation practice and the results are encouraging. Space here does not permit reporting on study findings. However, as a further indicator of institutional involvement in evaluation, of the persons who were surveyed, 130 expressed interest in

participating in a repository of evaluation efforts--a centrally located bank where activities could be collected and recorded.

What's comming up next? Practitioners have continued to ask for models to be employed for doing program evaluations. In response to this request three institutions--Texas A&M University, The University of Texas at Austin and the R&D Center--are collaboratively developing a "models-building" agenda. This activity is being driven by practitioner need; the products are expected to meet practitioner requirements. The practice of program evaluation is growing in sophistication and complexity.

Is Program Evaluation Useful?

There are critics who ask, is all this useful anyhow? In a recent issue of the Journal of Teacher Education (Katz et al., 1981), a group of thoughtful scholars inquired into this question. They reviewed the limited references which report on evaluation and follow-up studies and were concerned about the utility of such studies. A second group of scholars, also concerned about the value of such studies, responded (Adams, et al., 1981). The over-riding contention of the Adams and colleagues' response is that "the broader social spectrum within which program evaluation is conducted" and the utilization of the data generated by evaluation and follow-up studies dictates how studies should be done, by whom, for whom, and of what value it will be.

Now it appears that ours is a data collection profession rather than a data using one. And this would seem to be the case with the results from evaluation studies. Who sees the evaluation findings? How are findings disseminated? What are the expectations for use of the findings? It is very clear that something more must be done with the information than just sending out a summary of findings. The problem is that doing more than just sharing summaries implies that some individuals or some things have to change. Isn't

it interesting that we who focus our professional energies on learning, or change in others, are terribly reluctant to change ourselves and our practices.

We feel that the use of the data gained from evaluation for program decision making is crucial. This is the key issue. In our opinion program evaluation must contribute to program development; evaluation information must be fedback into the program for planning, refining and decision making purposes. This is the bottom line for the improvement of teacher education program practice.

At this time there are institutions that appear to be giving serious thought to the examination of their teacher education programs. There are a handful of institutions, including Ohio State University, Western Kentucky University and The University of Texas at Austin which are about to make major moves in terms of reexamining their programs. Perhaps these institutions will be able to provide some leadership and advice to others who are interested in following suit.

Due to the interest of legislators, unfortunately more so than teacher educators, various types of evaluation data are going to be available in the future that have not been available in the past. These include program evaluation data, follow-up evaluation data and inservice teacher licensing data. All of these data provide useful information that could be of assistance to the design and further development of teacher education programs. It will be interesting to see whether out of this conference, as well as the work of particular institutions, evaluation data are used to further develop particular programs. Or in other instances, the evaluation data may be used to eliminate programs that are clearly not doing the job and are not responsive to the needs.

In Conclusion

So how does program evaluation fit into the future of teacher education? We believe it can be a unifying force. The program evaluation network, TEPFU, has been the focus that has linked practitioners and administrators across a vast geography and a broad array of programs. A part of its membership, in interactive sharing and collaboration, is currently focusing on the design of a plan to produce a modest number of practical and acceptable models to be employed in evaluation studies of programs. This activity is again a response to the constituency which is calling for more help. Interestingly, individuals and institutions are sharing.

They have decided that the craft is worth saving and rather than abandon ship, they are pulling together. This could be a model for the whole of teacher education.

References

Adams, R. D. Western Kentucky University follow-up evaluation of teacher education graduates. In S. M. Hord & G.E. Hall (Eds.) Teacher education program evaluation: A collection of current efforts. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1981.

Adams, R. D. & Craig, J. R. National survey of evaluation practices in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, Kentucky, November, 1981.

Adams, R. D., Craig, J. R., Hord, S. M. & Hall, G. E. Program evaluation and program development in teacher education: A response to Katz et al. (1981). Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(5), 21-25.

Ayers, J. B. Teacher education program study at Tennessee Technological University. In S. M. Hord & G.E. Hall (Eds.) Teacher education program evaluation: A collection of current efforts. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1981.

Borich, G. Three models for conducting follow-up studies of teacher education and training. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1979.

Hall, G. E. A national agenda for research and development in teacher education (1979-1984). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1979.

Hord, S. M. & Adams, R. D. (Eds.) Teacher education program evaluation, 1981: Theory and practice. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1981.

Hord, S. M. & Hall, G. E. (Eds.) Teacher education program evaluation and follow-up studies: A collection of current efforts. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1978.

Howsam, R. B., Corrigan, D. C., Denemark, G. W. & Nash, R. J. Educating a profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. Teacher training research: Working hypotheses for program design and directions for further study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April, 1981.

Katz, L. Raths, J., Mohanty, C., Kurachi, A. & Irving, J. Follow-up studies: Are they worth the trouble? Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(2), 18-24.

Sandefur, J. T. An illustrated model for the evaluation of teacher education graduates. Washington, D.C.: American Asociation of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.

Smith, B. O. A design for a school of pedagogy. In collaboration with Silverman, S., Borg, J. M., & Fry, B. V. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.